OSHA's Proposed Rule on ETS

P. 2: Can we argue that all ETS constituents regulated by OSHA do not exceed the respective PELs?

P. 6: ... *the small pollutant loads from smoking at the levels which we observe, without necessarily expose nonsmokers to significantly elevated levels ...*

Can this be qualified?

P. 7: ... *all indicators for ETS are at extremely low, de minimis levels ...*

... that exposure to ETS will be de minimis.

Quantify!

P. 7: ... *return and outside air will be filtered prior to returning to the supply system.*

Filtering of return air seems unusual!

P. 10: ... *all concentrations of UVPM and formaldehyde were low*

Relative to what?

P. 12: *The data indicate little nonsmoker exposure ...*

Quantify!

P. 11: *Three cigarettes per year in ...*

Can we argue that this view is shared by epidemiologists (e.g., Fontham) who set the smoker/nonsmoker treshold at 100 cig. in a life working time?

P. 14: *resulted in substantial reductions of exposure ...*

Can it be shown that a ban is not significantly more effective?

P. 14: ... *a level consistent with these ... with smokers.*

Why would this agreement be relevant?

P. 18: ... *and nonsmoker exposure to ETS constituents was greater than in buildings (1) and (2)*

How much? Significantly?

2029234365

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/tyvk0000

P. 18: *Nicotine was below the level of detection ...*

There is no general level of detection.

Here we argue as if nicotine were a quantitative marker for ETS?

P. 20: *removes ETS constituent levels ... below levels of detection or quantitation*

Detection levels are not toxicologically relevant. Do level fall below PELs?

P. 25: *increase in outside air ventilation will incur costs in the redesign*

It will increase energy costs significantly!

"Irritation" defined

P. 8: *contribution from ETS ... of ten indistinguishable from background levels.*

except for its odor!

2029234366

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/tyvk0000